

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8-10, 12, 13, 16, 18-22, 28 and 29 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objections and rejections in view of the amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended by the Examiner during the telephone interview of April 13, 2005, during which the above amendments were discussed for placing the application in condition for allowance based on an agreement reached between the Examiner and the undersigned.

Claims 1-11 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "a computer-implemented method...referencing the anchor and the object based on respective locations within a meta-document, wherein the meta-document is a collection of the seed document and the at least one hyperlinked document; and publishing the meta-document."

As per the Examiner's suggestion at page 12 of the Final Office Action, claim 1 has been amended to include "computer-implemented method" and is therefore believed to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 2-11 and 28 depend from claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner stated essentially that "the seed

document comprising at least one hyperlink to the at least one hyperlinked document” was not supported by the specification.

As discussed during the telephone interview, the specification includes descriptions of the seed document at, *inter alia*, page 8, lines 18-20 and page 10, lines 15-20; wherein the seed document is an initial document having a hyperlink pointing to another document. Thus, the specification is believed to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-14, 16-22, 28 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pirolli et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,8952,470) in view of Lapstun et al. (USPN 6,728,000). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Pirolli and Lapstun teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 1, 3, 4, 6-14, 16-22, 28 and 29.

Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to include the limitations of claims 7 and 11, and 14 and 17, respectively. During the telephone interview of April 13, 2005, it was agreed that the combined teachings of Pirolli and Lapstun do not teach or suggest the limitations of claims 11 and 17. Accordingly, claims 1 and 13 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 3, 4, 6-10, 12 and 28 depend from claim 1. Claims 16, 18-22 and 29 depend from claim 13. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1 and 13 respectively. Claims 7, 11, 14 and 17 have been cancelled.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1, 3, 6, 8-10, 12, 13, 16, 18-22, 28 and 29, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889